

THE
ACLS
NEWSLETTER

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES
A MEMBER OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME VII

WINTER 1956-1957

NUMBER 4

DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

APR 20 1957

Contents

Editor, M. N. C.	PAGE
The Service of the University	3
The FSI Revisited	14
Towards a Wider Vision	18
Notes	22

2101 R Street, N.W., Washington 8, D.C.

ADMINISTRATION

OFFICERS

Chairman

Howard Mumford Jones, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Vice-Chairman

Walter H. C. Laves, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Secretary

Paul L. MacKendrick, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Treasurer

Harold B. Hoskins, WASHINGTON, D. C.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Curt F. Buhler

PIERPONT MORGAN LIBRARY

Rensselaer Lee

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Frederick H. Burkhardt

BENNINGTON COLLEGE

Roger P. McCutcheon

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

J Milton Cowan

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Whitney J. Oates

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

John Hope Franklin

BROOKLYN COLLEGE

John A. Wilson

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

EXECUTIVE STAFF

Waldo G. Leland, *Director Emeritus*

Mortimer Graves, *Executive Director*

D. H. Daugherty, *Assistant to the Director*

J. F. Wellemeyer, Jr., *Staff Adviser on Personnel Studies*

Shirley Duncan Hudson, *Public Affairs Officer*

Earle W. Brockman, *Staff Associate in Languages and Linguistics*

Alice M. Harger, *Bursar*

Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office at Richmond, Virginia. Published quarterly by The American Council of Learned Societies. Address all communications regarding the ACLS *Newsletter* to (Mrs.) Shirley Duncan Hudson, at the Office of Publication, Box 2-W, Richmond 5, Virginia, or at the business office at 2101 R St., N. W., Washington 8, D. C.

The Service of the University

BY HOWARD MUMFORD JONES

PHILOSOPHICALLY speaking, a university is defined as a congregation of scholars engaged in the discovery, preservation, and inculcation of truth. Scholars, of course, include scientific investigators. Those who desire to learn are supposed to attend upon this congregation and, through an apprenticeship system descending from the Middle Ages, master the mysteries of the art and practice of some branch of learning. They commence scholar, to use the archaic phrase, when they win the first degree in the arts, but their real initiation into the priesthood of learning comes only when they have achieved an advanced degree. On this formal theory the congregation of scholars creates its own corporation, owns its own assets, elects its own administrative head, assesses its own fees, makes its own rules, and lives its own life within, yet apart from, the community in which it is housed. The institution, in this definition, can exist as well under one form of the nation-state as under any other; and the theory ignores time and space, government, religion, business, war and peace, depression and prosperity. It is directed to the pure pursuit of truth.

Whatever the merit of this great ideal—and that it has greatness is clearly proved by our perpetual debate over the principles of academic freedom—it is probable that no such university ever existed. When theology was the queen of the sciences and all secular knowledge was subsumed under theology, the European university was protected by the aegis of the church; its faculty was dominated by the doctors of sacred theology; the knowledge it pursued was not, and could not be, heretical; and its ultimate head was the head of the Christian faith. This theory and system still constitute the framework of the Roman Catholic colleges and universities.

With the growth of humanism, the coming of the Protestant Reformation, and the rise of modern science the founders or patrons of universities, especially in the north of Europe, came to alter in type and to be drawn not from predominantly religious figures but from secular authorities, such as kings, princes, noblemen, and in some cases even cities. Medieval forms continued, of course, and continue to this day, as any commencement ceremony evidences. But from the Renaissance through the Age of Enlightenment, there was a slow drift toward acceptance of the place of secular government in the organization of the university, without, however, ever wholly destroying recognition of the university as a corporation. Thus Oxford and Cambridge

long sent representatives to the British Parliament; the kingdom of Prussia established the great University of Berlin during the Napoleonic Wars; and, for that matter, Napoleon himself, in modernizing France, created an entire educational system under the title and theoretical control of the University of France, a system echoed in this country in the creation and legal powers of the Regents of the University of the State of New York.

In Europe, however, or at least in Europe north of the Pyrenees and west of the Vistula, governmental creation or support did not extinguish the independent life of the university. An ancient tradition struggled against the concept of the efficient state; and though government might, and frequently did, deplore the uselessness of university learning or deprecate the views expressed from various university chairs, government usually found it wiser not to interfere. Government commonly confined its activities to the formal confirmation of university appointments when that was necessary and to making such grants from government funds as might be needed to sustain the life of the institution. It took years for the British Parliament to carry through reforms necessary to modernize Oxford and Cambridge; and, though this tolerance of obsolescent education does no credit to the academic mind, the reluctance of Parliament to alter ancient customs shows how firmly entrenched in Europe was (and is) the tradition of university autonomy.

In the Latin countries of the New World—that is, in the territory south of Texas and, in some small measure, in Quebec—the developing structure of universities more nearly parallels Renaissance tradition than it does the formula we are more familiar with in the United States. A typical case is the University of Guatemala, the history of which, charmingly set forth by Professor John Tate Lanning in a recent book, will seem to administrators in the United States a perfect example of how not to manage an institution of learning.

Here, in the United States, our concept of the university has been our own. It has developed on its own lines, and, it seems to me at least, has differentiated itself more and more sharply from the formula for universities elsewhere in the world.

Take the differences first, since to list them may sharpen our sense of the uniqueness of the American situation. We have, to begin with, no clear and consistent concept of the difference between a university and a college. Norwich University in Vermont is not a university but a military school, whereas Bryn Mawr College performs many of the functions of a university. Yale University colleges are living quarters, but I have known state teachers colleges that referred to the first-string football team as the varsity. We do not in this country, as they do at Oxford and Edinburgh, elect an honorary head of the institution, called the "Chancellor," leaving to a Vice-Chancellor the actual conduct of administration, although I see some symptoms that this

distinction is developing among us. We do not even elect an annual head, or "Rector," as they do at Munich. Our presidents are chosen for an indefinite tenure, and are not elected by scholars but put over us by a quite non-academic body known as "Regents" or "Trustees"; it is, we say, their "responsibility" to do so. Again, the whole colorful life of the American undergraduate campus is unknown in Europe, barring an occasional spring festival like that in Oslo; and the responsibility which an American institution feels for housing, feeding, and looking after its customers is virtually non-existent in Europe, where the university is conceived as an institution for the adult, not for the adolescent. Finally, let us remember that in point of law the American professor is nothing more than the hired employee of a corporate body over which he has no control, whereas in Europe and in other continents the professor is *ex officio* a member of the corporate body called the university. This arises in large part because in Europe the university, in the medieval sense of the word, preceded the corporation in our sense of the word, just as it preceded the modern nation-state. But in this country the situation is far otherwise.

In this republic we differentiate between the privately endowed institutions and those that are publicly supported, between the ivy league and the state universities and colleges. The difference between the two groups has become a real difference, but it is not a difference in origins. With us the beginnings of the state preceded the beginnings of the university. The first university was as much the creation of the state as is the University of North Dakota. The public corporation known as the Massachusetts Bay Colony anteceded the President and Fellows of Harvard College, who were in fact their legal constructs; and in Virginia the colony gained and lost a charter prior to the creation of William and Mary in 1693. The same type of historical development holds true for the other colonial colleges. They were the creations of the state; and to this day, though there are colleges supported from private funds rather than from tax money, no college, no university, no degree-granting institution of any kind can exist without the prior consent of government, state, or federal, or in certain cases territorial. You can in many commonwealths start a tutoring school, or a kindergarten, or a college of embalming, or a school of commercial art without the consent of the state, even though you may eventually have for one reason or another to submit to inspection by a state agency; but nowhere in the United States can you lawfully confer a recognized academic degree without the approbation of government. Academic institutions have uniformly been the legal creatures of the government, not of the church, and not of scholars spontaneously meeting and declaring their intention of teaching. Meet they may as much as they wish, but they cannot confer degrees without the state's consent.

To this general rule there is one type of apparent and fleeting exception,

but the exception is only apparent. Harvard College was intended to perpetuate a learned ministry; William and Mary in Virginia and King's College in New York had their associations with the Anglican faith, then the state church in those colonies; Yale and Princeton also had their religious sanctions and purposes. Not until Benjamin Franklin started the school that eventually became the University of Pennsylvania do we have an institution of higher learning in America wholly secular in its purposes. But true though this is, it is also true that the state, not the church, possessed the legal authority to create a degree-granting college, just as it is true that the gradual legal secularization of these more ancient colleges sprang from the authority of the state.

I suggest that this fact is of tremendous significance. It means that from the earliest times American higher education has been both the creation and the responsibility of the state; that any church or any association of private persons desiring to create a degree-granting school must comply with the laws of the state before it can even begin; and that the state may, for cause, step into any situation where, in the judgment of competent opinion, the charter granted an institution is being used to conceal fraud, and may insist upon amendment, as has been done in the case of certain fraudulent medical schools. It is not too whimsical to say that long before we had a pure food and drug act, we had a pure degree act; and even though in most cases the matter is a mere formality, the important fact is that the formality exists and is demanded and guaranteed by *government*, not by scholars, not by priests, not by commercial persons operating schools for private gain.

The fundamental fact that in American history the state precedes the university and that the university is the creature of the state and can have no foundation for its legal being other than public law, explains our unique problem in governing and controlling our universities. In the typical American situation the college secures a charter, but the charter, or in the case of publicly supported institutions, the constitutional provision or the public law proceeding from the constitution, does *not* create the college. It merely creates a corporation or a board that is authorized to create a college. In law, therefore, the university as an autonomous congregation of scholars engaged in the discovery, preservation, and inculcation of truth does not exist. All that exists is a board of trustees or regents charged with the duty of hiring persons by contract to do certain acts. The chief among these persons is commonly called the president. In the case of charters granted to private institutions he may sometimes also be the president of the board, but even as president of the board he is as much legally subject to dismissal for being an unprofitable servant as any instructor or teaching fellow of low degree. The American concept is in no way (except as an after-thought) the concept of a congregation of scholars engaged in discovering and preserving truth; it is

instead, the concept of an arm of the state intended to get things done or authorizing other persons, in the case of charters granted to private colleges, to hire certain persons to get things done. In no case do the charter and the privilege go directly to the scholars who are theoretically the institution.

As our population spreads westward, it is interesting to see how persons thus authorized go about the creation of universities. The board is created, it meets, it elects a chairman, but, once it has determined where the university is to be, it does not send out invitations to scholars to apply or to attend, it does not announce that it is prepared to receive proposals for a professorship in chemistry, a professorship in internal medicine, a professorship in Latin, and so on. Rather, its next step is to select an agent to secure the services of such employees as in his judgment he can hire. By implication, the board declares its technical incompetence, and delegates its powers to an agent. This agent is the president, who, as the representative of the board, becomes not merely the general manager of the nascent enterprise but also the only channel of communication between the members of the board, who in most cases have no professional academic competence, and the body of scholars which alone, in any intellectual sense, constitute the desired university.

If the formal definition of a university as a congregation of scholars accumulating and disseminating truth is accepted, this development is obviously an arresting anomaly. Goodwill is the only thread connecting the premise with the conclusion. If this good will is lacking, all goes awry, as in the case of a state institution, the president of which flatly informed a professor of biology that he was hired to teach so many classes of so many students and if he didn't like it, he could jolly well get out. The American Association of University Professors struggles with the anomalies of the American theory of university creation and university management, and from time to time presents us with a melodrama from academic life, in which the professor is commonly cast as Eliza, the president appears as Simon Legree, and the board of regents are the baffled bloodhounds.

These abuses in the American system often arise from innocence. The trustees or the regents or the president, who is sometimes imported into the situation because he has name value in the political or business world, is unable to understand that the professor, though he is legally only a hired man, is a very special sort of hired hand, from whom the legal theory underlying his hiring should be gracefully concealed. But although there are, I suppose, annually many violations of the rules of the American Association of University Professors—certainly there must be more than ever get reported in their *Bulletin*—the astonishing thing is not that these violations occur, but that they are few. The American pattern for creating and administering a university makes no great amount of sense if you consider the example of more experienced parts of the world as paramount, but inasmuch as our

pattern is one under which a score or so of American universities have risen in a very few decades to world influence, it is just possible that the example of other parts of the world need not be paramount. I have spoken of good will as the chief nexus between the governing board and the congregation of scholars. This good will is, I think, commonly underestimated. Hundreds of busy men acting as regents and trustees have been willing to give of their time to institutions, the necessity of which they see but the operations of which they do not always comprehend, but by humbling themselves to learn, they have tried to grasp the nature of the university. If American universities, public and private, are today sought out by scholars from all parts of the world, surely some credit is due to the trustees and regents who have helped shape these institutions. The foolish or cowardly behavior of a small fraction of these trustees should not blind us to the notable achievement of the vast majority of them over the years.

That the American pattern for creating and governing a university is anomalous seems clear. The philosophic concept of the university moves in one direction; the actual legal doctrine moves in precisely the opposite direction. The first exemplifies democracy on a high plane, the second administrative autocracy. This conflict has troubled a good many critics, among them men as varied in their points of view as Thorstein Veblen, Upton Sinclair, and Simon Flexner. In moments of crisis, moreover, the university administrator or the university trustees are commonly charged with being dictatorial; and sometimes, in fact, they are.

Yet is it not true that our anomalous American pattern for governing universities is of a piece with our inconsistent but workable democratic culture? The shortcomings of political democracy as a form of government have been the occasion of despairing comment from the Federalist days of John Adams to the time of Walter Lippmann. No one can reasonably deny that our political democracy, from the Congress to the town meeting, could be improved. We do not vote in the numbers we should, we frequently do not vote on any ascertainable principle of rational choice, we frequently vote in haste and amend at leisure. Yet perhaps the true index of our democratic culture is to be found not in the weakness of our political system, but the strength of our system outside politics—in the clubs, the societies, the groups, national, state, and local, that diversify our national life. Whatever the group we join, whether it be the Modern Language Association or the Wednesday afternoon sewing club, International Rotary, or the vestry of the local Episcopal church, it is almost invariably run on the lines of a Greek democracy. We meet and organize, so to speak, under Robert's Rules of Order; we adopt a constitution giving everybody a voice in the affairs of the society, electing officers for limited terms, protecting the minority in its right, and excluding or expelling dissident or unwanted members only after ample opportunity has

been given them to alter their ways, the expulsion coming in accordance with clear and simple rules, if it has to come at all. Even the most impromptu gathering in America commonly proceeds upon tacit assumptions of fair play; if it does not, we distrust it. Nothing is more damning to a labor union, a patriotic society, the board of local charities, or any other American gathering, formal or informal, than the suspicion that the meeting has been rigged, that a steam roller has been run over dissent. On the mere probability of such a charge, associations and clubs have perforce been split. Indeed, is not our whole objection to Communist methods that, though they keep the forms of democracy, they violate its meaning?

In spite of the inconsistency between the legal theory of its management and the philosophical theory of its function, the American university operates, and operates successfully, because it is staffed by Americans reared on that simplest of all formulas for getting men to work together, the democratic formula, and is itself in the great current of the national life which flows according to these formulas. Even the most arbitrary president of a university cannot get along without that most ubiquitous of democratic inventions, the committee. In the long run the majority faculty opinion wins out and the tyrannical dean or the reactionary board of trustees is defeated because he or they are struggling vainly to stifle a deep, ethical instinct in the American people.

The American university as the creation of the American people is fundamentally an expression of this popular instinct for equality and use. Most Americans give at least lip service to the famous proposition set forth in the North-West Ordinance of 1787: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government, and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." Most Americans have done more. They wanted education and set out to get it. They felt that the instruments of the government they were improvising or creating offered the quickest means by which to spread education over a vast territory; and on pragmatical grounds of need and immediate experience rather than after a study of European precedent, they brought the unique American system into being—the local schoolboard, the state-wide board of regents, the charter for the trustees of the privately endowed institution.

The great virtue of this remarkable invention is that it rests upon a particular theory of education, including higher education, as a form of public service. The great reproach brought against the ivy colleges in the old days was, indeed, that they did not recognize this doctrine, but were on the contrary expressive of snobbery. The eventual response of the ivy colleges to this reproach is, I think, illuminating. They did not defend the necessity, perhaps even the duty, of creating an intellectual elite in a world so specialized that half the physicists do not know what the other half are talking about; on

the contrary, they demonstrated that they are just as public and popular as anybody else. With us, in truth, the popular theory has triumphed over the concept that the nation needs an intellectual elite, and the notion of the university as a service institution prevails in the United States to a degree that astonishes the foreign scholar.

When a state law compels the state university to admit to its beginning class any graduate of a state high school simply because he or she is a graduate and regardless of his or her qualifications for the intellectual life, this result of the doctrine that the primary duty of the university is to serve the state must either delight or depress the observer, all depending upon his philosophy of education and his concept of democratic culture. This is perhaps the doctrine of service in an extreme form, but it should not be cited as evidence that the doctrine is itself wrong-headed. On the contrary, the concept of the state university in the service of the state has very great merits, as can be swiftly demonstrated. Cut off, in your imagination, the vast complex of university activities arising from this idea, reduce the university to its primary form as a congregation of scholars engaged in the passionless pursuit of truth, and see how much is altered. We abandon the extension division, correspondence courses, adult education, the short courses for farmers and other groups, the use of the university campus for all sorts of meetings not directly connected with higher education, the state-wide tours of the university band, the university orchestra and the university debaters, the reference services of the library, inter-library loans, the university radio, the accrediting system for secondary schools (at least in many commonwealths), the municipal reference bureau, the legislative reference bureau, the going out of faculty members to lecture and lead discussions in cities, towns, and villages, the informal relations between the university and religious denominations in the state, the easy access of puzzled citizens to scholar and scientist, the alumni association, the friends of the university library, teacher-training in all probability, the university as a center for state-wide activities in music, the theater, public speaking, and the graphic arts—these and a hundred other activities which we take for granted, disappear, and the university, in monastic seclusion, has no other concern for the life of the people than to secure its annual grant and to hope that by its mere existence it will do them good. In this catalogue I say nothing of athletics, for as regards university football I agree with ex-President Hutchins that it would be cheaper and more profitable to buy a string of horses and race them for a good-sized purse.

But this great concept of service to the state has also its characteristic weakness, and I am not sure we are always aware of its dangers. This weakness does not lurk in the administrative and legal anomaly of a congregation of scholars run like an industrial corporation under a general manager hired and retired by the board. As I have indicated, I think good will and a deep

national instinct for democratic behavior offset the difficulty here; and although cases of violating academic freedom continue to occur, no one familiar with the situation as it was, say, in 1890, and the situation as it is today but must feel that academic tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility are better understood and more generally accepted now than they were when Johns Hopkins was founded in 1876. I do not mean that all is rosy; I do mean that the firm insistence upon a set of principles by the American Association of University Professors, coupled with the ancient and healthy competition for men and prestige, have softened the asperities of the administrative-faculty tug of war.

It is elsewhere, I think, that we must look for our characteristic institutional weakness; and I suggest that that weakness lies not in the assumption that the dean or the president, the regent or the trustee is the natural enemy of the professor, but rather in the common failure of both administration and faculty to distinguish between the university as a service institution and the university as an institution in the service of the state.

You will recall how in Voltaire's *Candide* Dr. Pangloss demonstrates that noses were made to wear spectacles and therefore we have spectacles, that legs were made to wear breeches and therefore we have trousers. About half a century after that book appeared, the Rev. William Paley seized upon this tempting argument, and in his famous *Natural Theology* demonstrated that, with one notable exception, everything had a use and place in the world and so made for happiness. The one exception lay in the animal kingdom. His mind went willingly along with that of the Creator until he came to snakes, but there, he said regretfully, the provision of poison for venomous snakes seemed to him over-done. I think that in our enthusiasm for the university as a service institution, we may have rather over-done the notion of service.

I have been mildly critical of the philosophic concept of the university as a congregation of scholars pursuing truth for its own sake, although, as I also said, we would be poor indeed if we lost this great concept. A university is, or should be, a place dedicated to the adult pursuit of learning. It is not, or at least it should not be, an advanced high school; it is not a junior college; it is not an academy; it is not even synonymous with a college of liberal arts, though a college of liberal arts may properly be a constituent part of the American university. Above all, a university is not, or ought not to be, a place for the inculcation of the rudiments of intelligence and culture merely because, under our somewhat invertebrate system of public education, youth is earlier permitted to neglect these rudiments.

I do not believe the proper function of a university is to teach boys and girls the elements of spelling, punctuation, grammar, and the writing of simple sentences; yet I suppose the greater part of the time and energy of the largest single fraction of the staff of the American university is spent in doing,

not what the high school should have done, but what the grade school should have done for the high school. I do not believe the university is the place to begin studying a foreign language; yet another large section of the faculty is engaged in this absurdity. Like the daughters of Danaus, they yearly pour the elements of Spanish, French, or German into leaky buckets, the water running out of the buckets at the end of the year. The young have been so often assured that the English they have not mastered is the universal language of all mankind that they do not bother to learn any other—in shocking contrast to European and Asiatic youth. I do not believe the university is the place to teach the rudiments of arithmetic, algebra, and plane geometry, though such teaching, or something like it, occupies the time of most persons teaching mathematics in the American university. In fact I do not believe the university is the proper place to teach the elements of reading, or the elements of physics, or the elements of chemistry, or the elements of botany, or the elements of any other subject commonly supposed to be made available in the secondary schools. The American university, however, has taken on all these chores in the name of service and because, popular opinion to the contrary, the American university staff is too good-natured to refuse this service to the state.

One of the two wisest persons I have ever known—the other was Jane Addams of Hull House—was the late Alfred North Whitehead. Mr. Whitehead, I think, once uttered the cryptic remark that the characteristic weakness of the American university is good teaching. He had in mind the tendency to sacrifice the true function of a university to a secondary task. The true concern of a university is with learning, not with teaching. Teaching is but a secondary, even a misleading, function in this context. It is a misleading function when the concept of learning is, as is too often the case, sacrificed to the concept of teaching; when, for example, adolescents are solemnly asked to rate mature scholars in terms of their entertainment value in the classroom, and an administration in turn seriously accepts these callow judgments as a factor in the keeping and promoting of scholars. I wonder how Thoreau, Nietzsche, Veblen, Spinoza, Kierkegaard, or Aristotle would have fared in such a system.

I think the common misapprehension of the true nature of a university is demonstrated every spring and every fall when the representatives of the textbook industry swarm over our campuses, offering their wares for adoption, suggesting that a desk copy of such and such a book will improve everything, and persuading professors that the best way to get their views into circulation is to write something for freshmen. Imagine an interview between an American textbook salesman and the historian of the decline and fall of the Roman empire! And picture Gibbon's bewilderment at being told that a poll of sophomore classes showed that his work was too long, too learned,

and too literary, and that, to be published, it must be reduced to a single, short, snappy volume suitable for the adolescent mind and making constant references to social parallels between ancient Rome and modern America!

As it is a matter of common report that fundamental ideas in science and philosophy still originate for the most part in foreign countries because the Americans, with all their cleverness, all their equipment, all their admirable concern for human betterment, do not have opportunity for fundamental thinking in their universities but must withdraw from them and enter an Institute for Advanced Study or secure a Guggenheim Fellowship to take them away from institutions that are supposed to exist for furthering fundamental thought, I wonder if we may not be overplaying our hand in this matter of service. Extreme busyness in the name of service, of teaching, of committee work, of laudable outside activities first threatens, then curtails, and finally overwhelms many conscientious and able specialists who might in other circumstances have devoted themselves to thought.

The university, without abandoning its admirable relation to the state, must remain the capital and fortress of thought. Emerson's definition of the scholar still holds: it is man thinking. As we exhaust our natural resources, as our wonderful machines pile leisure like an embarrassment around us, as the tensions and perplexities of the world increase about us, as the life span lengthens and the population grows, we have need of man thinking—thinking fundamentally, thinking philosophically, thinking morally; for without thought the people perish. It is good to serve, but if I may alter a familiar line, they also serve who only stand and think. Our noisy and pleasant activities on the campus fill the ear with sound, but at the heart of the university there should always be a zone of silence, a quiet and protected place away from the market and the Rotary Club, where our best men can discover truth, preserve it, and diffuse it, not as service but as idea. That is the core of the university concept, and if we lose it, we lose everything. Can we somehow at once combine and separate the two aspects of American university life—the day-to-day serviceability to the state that public universities so admirably have developed, and the protection of man thinking in the light of time and eternity? To protect that man is the quintessential service of the university to the state, and the continuing problem of the American institution is how to fuse into a single whole these two excellent but opposed ideas of university life.

The FSI Revisited

BY HAROLD B. HOSKINS

SINCE my article on "The New Foreign Service Institute Training Program," which appeared in the Winter 1955-56 issue of the *Newsletter*, significant strides have been made in the implementation of the Institute's new program, a considerable portion of which was at that time merely in the planning stage. Congress has increased its appropriations to the Institute and thus enabled us to put into effect a largely revamped and extended program, and a new Advisory Committee, consisting of nine distinguished leaders from private and academic life, has been organized and has already met four times. We can now be said to have in healthy, though still incomplete, being the equivalent of a graduate school of foreign affairs.

The function of the Institute is to "furnish training and instruction to officers and employees of the Foreign Service and the Department of State and to other officers and employees of the Government for whom training and instruction in the field of foreign relations is necessary". As readers of the *Newsletter* may remember, career training of the Foreign Service officer is designed to take place in three three-month periods of concentrated, full-time instruction: the first on his appointment to the career service and before he takes up his first foreign assignment, the second in mid-career, and the third when he becomes a senior officer. Today basic training is provided for all beginning officers; this basic course lasts three months and consists of two sections—Part I, foreign policy review and headquarters operations, and Part II, field work. The second period of career training is the three-month, mid-career course, which is the core—and at the moment the apex—of our training. It is of some interest to note that the mid-career course has already attained enough of a reputation that an increasing number of officers are requesting assignments to the course rather than waiting to be "drafted". The third period, consisting of advanced training in the diplomatic service, is the particular concern of the Advisory Committee but is still for the most part in the planning stage.

There are in operation at the Institute a large number of courses ranging from departmental orientation through consular and administrative training and language courses (not only in the world and European languages but also in a wide range of "exotics" such as Thai, Vietnamese, and Burmese) to foreign relations courses including subjects like Communist strategy, the current American scene, and atomic energy for peaceful uses. Every officer,

whether stationed at home or abroad, has a chance to avail himself of some type of training that will increase his value to the Service and, at the same time, advance his own career. Training opportunities may be divided into two categories: full-time or major career courses, six weeks or more in length, requiring assignment to the Institute for the duration of the course; and short or part-time courses at the Institute or in the field requiring no special assignment, but attended by the officer with the permission of his superior.

It should be emphasized that, except for the beginner's course, all these courses are voluntary, and no officer is compelled to take any particular type of training. It is not felt necessary to require them, for these training programs benefit the individual as well as the organization, and serve at once to improve the organization and to give the individual an opportunity to get ahead. The truth of this is well recognized on the American business scene, where periodic training on company time and at company expense is almost routine for many executives; in the academic world it is paralleled by the faculty study fellowships, such as have been awarded by the ACLS in the past and are envisaged for the future, in the original outline for which stress was laid on the value of the supplementary study not only to the applicant but also to the college or university with which he was connected. Moreover the very fact of leaving these courses in the voluntary category automatically renders them more selective; the routine worker with little ambition, who would probably constitute a brake on the speed of the course and would thus be undesirable in it, will not apply to take it and thus be self-excluded. And selectivity is not only desirable but will increasingly be exercised in the specialized training and full-time career courses which lie at the heart of the Institute's in-service program; preference will naturally be given to officers who show real potential for future advancement.

One of the most important aspects of the Institute's training is, of course, in the area of foreign languages. The Advisory Committee takes special interest in this, and several members have been outspoken in their criticism of officers, particularly those with long experience in this Service, who neglect to master at least one foreign language. In answer to the question, "Would you recommend dismissal of an otherwise brilliant officer who had failed to learn a language?", one adviser replied that he would scarcely consider an officer brilliant "who did not know at least one world language and who had not attempted to learn the language of at least one of the countries where he had been stationed." The term "world language" is used to describe a language widely understood by educated groups such as French, German, or Spanish. Other languages are often only regional in their usefulness.

There is additional need to step up the quality of part-time language instruction at posts abroad and to raise it to levels more nearly comparable to the quality of language teaching available at the Institute. One move al-

ready taken is the assignment of three language specialists to supervise instruction at a number of posts in Western Europe. The major objective of these linguistic supervisors, traveling as "circuit riders" from post to post within a region, will be to help improve the teaching techniques of the native instructors by showing them how to use more effectively the methods and language manuals developed at the Institute over the past ten years. In the spring of 1956 I visited the foreign service training branch schools in Tokyo, T'aichung, and Beirut, and talked about training needs with Chiefs of Mission and their staffs in Japan, T'aiwan, the Philippines, Viet Nam, Thailand, Burma, India, Pakistan, Lebanon, Germany, and France. I was impressed everywhere with the need for greater proficiency in the local language and, in many posts, for better and more up-to-date methods and materials for language instruction. For example, in Thailand my recollection is that out-of-date Army language material was still being used; in Burma I was told that several hours of language study were given to learning about how to buy a brown hat when no such thing as a brown hat exists in the whole of Burma! But above all I was impressed by the difficulty of combining the filling of a full-time substance job with taking language training at the same time; the result of such combined effort is usually unsatisfactory in both respects.

The first major course for incoming Foreign Service Officers at the introductory level is now being lengthened from three to six months to allow where needed for three months of concentrated language study. The officer who enters the Service with a language deficiency will, under this plan, be able to acquire some initial skill in one of the world languages before he goes abroad. This language he can continue to study part time at a post abroad.

Plans are also under consideration so that officers in the mid-career course will have a chance to acquire or perfect some language skill while assigned to the Institute. Similarly, a definite time for language study is included in our plans for senior officers. We have already given individualized language training to several Ambassadors and at least one Ambassador's wife.

The Department of State intends to improve the Foreign Service as far as language proficiency is concerned, and has as its objective that, within 5-8 years, every officer should have a useful knowledge of at least one language besides English. This means that every officer must have a greater opportunity to study foreign languages than formerly. Since present records indicate that only half the officers in the Foreign Service now have a useful knowledge of one of the so-called world languages, we at the Institute are taking a number of steps to correct this weakness. Lengthening the time of the regular career training periods to allow for more language work is one step. We also are interested in improving the language skills of the man or woman who may not be scheduled for further full-time career training; with this end in view we have scheduled more language classes at the Institute at

times convenient for officers on regular duty at Washington. This is particularly true for courses in world languages, but, provided an officer can arrange time, he may now receive intensive instruction at the Institute in almost any language required by the Service. In the coming fiscal year, we are also extending to officers at every foreign post, instead of to only a limited number, the right to study a world language on a part-time basis; and this opportunity will extend to wives as well!

By making language training an increasingly important part of the Institute's three general career courses, and by encouraging all Foreign Service officers to take advantage of language instruction opportunities at the Institute or in the field, we hope that within a relatively few years, as indicated above, every officer in the Service will be able to claim a useful fluency in at least one world language.

I have devoted the greater part of these notes to the question of language training not only because this is a field in which the ACLS has taken such a leading part, but also because it is our greatest single preoccupation at the Institute.

Communications of a physical nature have been accelerating at a dizzy speed in the past few years. If this rapid technical mobility is not matched by a speed-up in the two-way communication of ideas then the various societies in our world will be unable to adjust to their enlarged communities—which will lead to intensified and dangerous frictions which thwart our national interest abroad. The Foreign Service serves as the medium for transmitting messages between the United States and its larger world community. The Institute is therefore emphasizing in a double program, not only the substantive content of the material to be transmitted, but also the means—that of language.

Towards A Wider Vision

UNESCO took a step of great potential importance in its campaign to combat the obscurantism and outdated jingoism of the "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet" type when last year it appointed an international committee of educators to consider the Treatment of Asia in Western Textbooks and Teaching Materials. The Committee's lucid and wide-ranging report, published in November 1956, strikes deep at the roots of the whole problem of Occidental ignorance of the Orient. The ACLS, after nearly a generation of pioneer work in the establishment and encouragement of Oriental studies in this country, is most happy to give a short résumé of the findings and recommendations of this report.

Composed of representatives from eleven Western and three Asian countries and from two countries which may be regarded as both Asian and European, the Committee met in Paris from May 2 to 12, 1956, under the chairmanship of Merrill F. Hartshorn (United States of America). It had before it reports from many Western countries and a number of background papers by specialists to assist it in its deliberations on possible ways of improving the presentation of the history, geography, life, and cultures of the peoples of Asia. It gave particular attention to the civilizations of South Asia, Eastern Asia, and the Islamic world, and was primarily concerned with the pedagogical problems involved in the school presentation of Asian civilizations.

The report sets the whole question in perspective against the wider background of the growing interdependence of peoples in our time and the consequent necessity to adapt the content of education to new needs and possibilities. "Men must come," it states, "to see that their forebears and their fellows in all lands, in the East as in the West, have shared in a common struggle for civilization. They must be encouraged to acquire a greater awareness of the rich treasury of human achievement, as well as the many problems men have always faced. They must come to visualize the whole pageant of the splendors and miseries which is revealed in the story of man in his many environments at various periods of the historical process." It pleads for the use in schools of "reasonably coherent and balanced pictures of other civilizations . . . presented in human terms, in lively and readable accounts, on the basis of a just appreciation of social and cultural aspects as well as others, and without misleading, exaggerated or arid generalizations." It then proceeds to review the contents of the reports submitted by many UNESCO national commissions, which reveal, with certain exceptions and differences as between different countries, a general inadequacy of treatment, with omis-

sions, inaccuracies, distortions, derogatory statements, and so forth. Criticism is especially directed against the content of history textbooks and syllabuses, which are found to be for the most part Europe-centered and primarily focused on national history, and to refer to Asian lands solely in relation to military, political, colonial, or commercial contacts; Near Eastern civilizations tend to be treated solely as *roots* of European civilization and sometimes as though they were the only areas which had any early civilization; while remote Asian civilizations such as those of China, South Eastern Asia, India, and Japan are almost entirely neglected and their contributions to world or European history ignored. In general the picture is one of nation-centered cycloramas, which include Asian countries only in so far as the viewing nation has impinged upon them, and take little or no cognizance of their history as a whole or of its cultural, religious, and intellectual aspects. Little attention, even of a limited sort, is given to the achievements and problems of Eastern peoples either in earlier times or in the modern world.

It will be noted that this depressing picture is on the whole a portrayal of sins of omission rather than of commission. One encouraging aspect is the apparent lack of positive and intentional inaccuracies and misrepresentations. And yet the Committee finds many instances of narrow bias, Western or national prejudice, and lack of scholarly objectivity, particularly, of course, in connection with accounts of past or recent conflicts. At utter variance with Lord Acton's view that history without bias is not history, the Committee gravely lists the causes of these shortcomings, which it finds in the fundamentally patriotic purpose of much education, the frequently narrow and political emphasis of history teaching, the coloring and feeling engendered by colonial connections, the assumption of European superiority in modern civilization, much sheer ignorance of Eastern history and culture, and the general inadequacy of the place allotted in most Western history teaching to the systematic treatment of contemporary history in relation to the historical background of the modern world.

The task of correcting these ancient wrongs and deficiencies, whether at the primary and secondary school stage or in the institutions for teachers' education, is vast, both in extent and complexity. It involves many problems of judgment regarding the relative significance of events and ideas, of methods of approach, and of scope and balance—problems which do not admit of easy solution or necessarily of one opinion. But the Committee did commit itself to the view that teachers of history should not limit themselves to the mere dissemination of facts, but should attempt to interpret them in as objective, fair, and wide-ranging a fashion as possible, and that emphasis should be laid upon the specific contributions of Asian cultures to world civilization, and upon the general unity and continuity of world civilization through the ages. Also included among the Committee's broad recommenda-

tions were a more detailed treatment of some great Asian civilizations in order to provide understanding of their essential characteristics; the introduction of biographical material concerning prominent Asian figures; the vivid and realistic portrayal of ways of life and thought by reference to such matters as family, transport, food, education, architecture; literature; and the objective treatment of cultural contact between East and West especially during the last 200 years; and the study of some of the more basic contemporary issues in Asia, both from the point of view of internal development and of external relations.

It would seem that the history and geography courses in schools are the basis for such instruction; but the Committee feels that each of the other teachers should, within the limits of his competence, profit by every occasion to draw the attention of his pupils to Asian questions. It also draws attention to the possible use of audio-visual material, libraries, extracurricular talks, film showings, and discussions, and to interschool activities. The main recommendations, however, of the Committee are: that Asian studies in school curricula should be raised from their present lowly status; that textbooks should, whenever possible, be revised to give greater emphasis to Asia; that the training of teachers in this regard should be improved. This last item is, of course, basic to any general betterment. For teachers already in service, it could be effected to some degree by the traditional methods of pamphlets and books, and by seminars, supervised by Orientalists, during the school holidays. But from a long-range view the greatest need is for the revision of university courses, which should be made to include a study of Asian problems not as optional courses but as part of the normal curriculum. The Committee also attaches special importance to the preparation of anthologies of original writings by Asians translated into Western languages; these might be compiled to meet the needs of students at varying levels and should, in the Committee's view, be devoted not to specific Asian countries but to large regional groups stemming from a single civilization.

Concrete recommendations for follow-up action made by the Committee include: a further meeting on the Western side after a suitable interval; a corresponding meeting of Asian educators to examine the treatment of the West and inter-Asian relations in Asian textbooks; the organization by national authorities, with UNESCO assistance where necessary, of exchange textbooks and consultations between pairs of countries; regional meetings organized by one or several National Commissions; the preparation of additional and more widely based reports by National Commissions on the treatment of Western, Asian, and other cultures in textbooks, especially those for primary school use; the examination of the facilities for Asiatic studies in institutions of higher learning, particularly in programs of teacher-training; the provision of in-service training for teachers with regard to teaching about

Asia; that school curricula be made more flexible so as to encourage intensified study of Asia using community resources; and that special attention be given to the need for more and better educational material relating to Asia.

To this general report are appended a suggestive note by a working group of the Committee on the question of curricula to ensure the acquisition in Western schools of a better knowledge of the peoples of Asia; reports on a minimum general program by the Indian and Swiss representatives on the Committee; and some notes on Chinese civilization by Dr. V. Elisséeff and Mr. K. S. Pannikar.

Notes

The Council announces publication of *The Present-Day Relevance of Eighteenth-Century Thought*, edited by Roger P. McCutcheon.

This publication is a report of three panel discussions held in Washington, D. C., in January 1956 as part of the annual meeting of the Council. The topics considered by these panels were "The present validity of eighteenth-century doctrines of the state," "The eighteenth-century theories of man," and "Theories of art and aesthetics."

The panelists included Mark DeW. Howe (Harvard University), Richard B. Morris (Columbia University), Leo Gershoy (New York University), Louis Gottschalk (University of Chicago), Daniel J. Boorstin (University of Chicago), Walter L. Dorn (Ohio State University), Peter I. Gay (Princeton University), Ernest C. Mossner (University of Texas), Maynard Mack (Yale University), George Boas (Johns Hopkins University), Herbert Dieckmann (Harvard University), and Paul Henry Lang (Columbia University).

The cost of the publication is \$1.00. It may be ordered from the ACLS.

An interesting program, designed to improve international understanding on the legal side, has been worked out between the University of Istanbul, Columbia University Law School, and the Law School of the University of Michigan. Under it Elliott E. Cheatham (Charles Evans Hughes Professor of Law at Columbia) will serve as visiting professor at Istanbul for a period of ten months, while two Turkish scholars from the University of Istanbul will come to the United States, one to study at Columbia and the other at Michigan. Dr. Cheatham will take with him not only an administrative assistant but also a librarian who will assist in the classification, organization, and expansion of the library and documentary materials of law at the University of Istanbul.

This program, which will be carried out under a grant from The Ford Foundation, may prove to be only the start of a long-term cooperative arrangement in Istanbul, organized on a Turko-American basis; in any case it should make important contributions to international legal studies in an area of great economic and political interest.

The Institute on College Administration for presidents, deans, and other administrative officers, will be held at the University of Michigan from July 15 to 19 inclusive. The morning sessions will consist of presentations, by out-

standing resource persons, of the major themes in the programs: problems and trends in higher education, curriculum planning and administration, human relations factors in personnel administration, student personnel problems, purposes of higher education and their implementation. The afternoons will be devoted to discussion of specific topics and problems which may be suggested by those attending the Institute. Additional information may be obtained from the Director, Algo D. Henderson, 2442 U.E.S., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The Fund for the Advancement of Education announces the publication of *Schools for Tomorrow* by Alexander J. Stoddard, former Superintendent of Schools in Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and elsewhere, and for ten years Chairman of the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association. Dr. Stoddard, who has just completed a year-long survey of the major problems of the American public schools, pleads for the universal incorporation of television in the country's public schools and estimates that this would effect a saving of 100,000 teaching positions and more than \$500,000,000 in teaching salaries. He urges that no elementary, junior or senior high school be built without one or more television studios and closed-circuit apparatus to all parts of the building; in this way the traditional plan of education could be superseded by one involving the use of a task force of specialists rather than general practitioners attempting to carry on all the processes involved on a self-contained basis. This forward-looking book, whose thesis suggests the solution for a number of current problems in the public schools, can be obtained from the offices of the Fund, 655 Madison Avenue, New York 21, New York.

We have received from René Welles (Yale University) an outline of the aims and functions of the Committee for the Promotion of Advanced Slavic Cultural Studies, Inc., which was formed in 1949 and incorporated in March of that year under the Membership Corporation Law of the State of New York. Gifts to it are tax deductible.

The existence, field, and plans of this Committee are of importance, both immediate and long-range. The following brief abstract is provided for readers who may be unacquainted with the Committee and its work.

In face of the problem of Anglo-Saxon backwardness in the study of the East European cultural past and consequent bafflement by Russian behavior, the Committee sees the topical and uninformed Western interest in Russia as being of a kind that overlooks the deep and intensive scholarly foundations necessary to sustain that superstructure of knowledge which is essential to any real understanding of and permanent, peaceful relationship with Russia. These foundations include knowledge of the Slavic origins, languages, po-

litical and economic history and ideas, influences, and emotional reflexes. The Committee, therefore, conceives its task to be encouragement of Slavic cultural studies in every way, and, specifically, to find funds for the preparation and publication of significant scholarly manuscripts in this field and the bringing to this country of those Slavic scholars of the first rank who are available to come here. The Committee emphasizes that its aim is not to provide means of mass education and popularization in Russian matters, but rather to provide the professors and work materials for the high-quality students who are now presenting themselves for advanced study in the Slavic field. Thus the Committee would assist in the building up of a group of Slavic specialists who, while born in the West, will be thoroughly at home in their Slavic background. The publications envisaged by the Committee will, therefore, be of key works and studies on the highest plane of scholarly excellence in the areas of Slavic studies which, although remote to the layman, are valuable tools for advanced studies. The materials for the composition of readers, advanced grammars, surveys, handbooks, lexicons, dictionaries, atlases, up-to-date bibliographies, and general reference works are all in existence in libraries in this country; it is a primary aim of the Committee to assist in bringing such textbooks, of the right quality, into being.

The Committee, while disavowing any intention of maintaining lecture-ships or professorial chairs, also hopes to be able to bring to this country Slavic scholars who are now stranded in Western Europe as a consequence of the war. Their number is limited, and they are all well known through their publications.

The Committee consists of R. Gordon Wasson, *Chairman*, Ferdinand W. Coudert, *Secretary*, Frank Altschul, George F. Kennan, Philip E. Moseley, and Curt H. Reisinger; and is assisted by an Advisory Board of Slavic scholars made up of Michael Karpovich, *Chairman*, Roman Jakobson, and René Wellek. It is the duty of the Board to prepare projects for recommendation, following which the Committee allocates such funds as may be at its disposal among the projects submitted.

Various scholarly and professional organizations are cooperating with the President's Committee for Hungarian Refugee Relief in an effort to welcome and assist Hungarian escapees of high scholarly or professional qualifications on their arrival in this country. It has been estimated that over ten per cent of the present authorized total of 21,500 refugees will fall into the category of "professional, technical, and kindred workers." Because of the limited facilities at Camp Kilmer it is necessary to proceed as rapidly as possible with the work of aiding these potentially very valuable assets in our national life to find suitable employment and thus make full use of their talents while at

the same time benefiting the institutions and communities with which they become associated.

The National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, working with the President's Committee and in conjunction with the American Council for Refugees in the Professions and other national organizations, has established an office at Camp Kilmer to help identify and place individuals possessing advanced scientific or other scholarly or professional training, and is urgently inviting information on employment opportunities, especially those of a level requiring the doctorate or an advanced engineering degree. Such opportunities will be brought to the attention of refugees who seem to possess the requisite qualifications, and efforts will be made to provide channels for direct contact between the individuals and the institutions where the openings exist, and at the same time to give each person a chance to consider a variety of employment possibilities. Information about these possibilities should be sent in duplicate, the original to the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington 25 D.C., Attention: Office of Scientific Personnel (tel: Executive 3-8100), and the carbon copy to the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council Office, c/o President's Committee, Building 1305, Camp Kilmer, New Jersey (tel: Charter 9-5883).

As time is of great importance in this matter, we are quoting germane information supplied by the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council:

"Arrivals in this country from Hungary are in two categories, those with visas for immigration (some 6500) and those admitted on a "parolee" basis. In the first case the law requires a sponsor who will guarantee that for a period of one year the individual will not become a public charge. In the second case the legal requirement is less strict, but some degree of responsibility must be assumed. The necessary arrangements in both cases are usually made in the community where the individual is placed, often with the help of local welfare agencies.

Some language training courses for escapees who do not speak English have been arranged and others are being considered. Many who do not speak English speak French or German.

In any information provided with respect to openings the following items should be included:

1. Name and location of institution
2. Description of position available; field of work; nature of duties (e.g., teaching, research, development, engineering, management)
3. Level of salary or other support
4. Estimated starting date and duration of employment

5. Language requirements, and availability of local training in English if necessary
6. Name, address, telephone of your representative for further negotiations
7. Housing available (some escapees are accompanied by wife and children)
8. Group or organization willing to act as sponsor, if known
9. This information previously given to _____
10. Other information that you consider helpful"

A program is also being developed and implemented to help such of the refugees as are still students. The World University Service, in cooperation with a joint advisory committee composed of representatives from the Institute of International Education, the World University Service, the International Rescue Committee, the U. S. National Student Association, and other educational institutions, is handling the placement of these students, whose number may reach a total of between 1,500 and 2,000, in colleges and universities in this country.

Meanwhile a program designed to give the students intensive training in the English language and to equip them for study in American colleges is being administered by the Institute of International Education, with monies provided by the Ford, Rockefeller, and other foundations. Two centers of language and orientation are already in operation, one at Bard College, where courses began on December 22 and will continue until February 25, and the other at St. Michael's College, where courses began on January 21. Other universities are planning to offer similar courses. Students will, after careful screening, be nominated to these programs by the various resettlement agencies. Numerous offers of scholarships have been extended to the refugee students by American colleges and universities, and the courses at Bard and St. Michael's are intended to give sufficient training in the English language and intensive orientation to the American scene to enable them to take advantage of these opportunities.

Many of our readers will already be acquainted with the first (1954) edition of *The National Interest and Foreign Languages* which William Riley Parker wrote at the request of the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO, on which he is ACLS representative.

Mr. Parker, who was until recently Secretary of the Board of Directors of the ACLS and is, happily, still with us in the capacity of Delegate from the Modern Language Association, has reorganized and completely revised this booklet, which now appears in a second edition and is obtainable from the Government Printing Office for sixty-five cents. Also, in the Winter (January 1957) issue of *College and University* the same writer had a kindred article

entitled "Why a Foreign Language Requirement?", of which offprints are available gratis from the MLA.

Not for the first time the editor regrets the lack of a review section in the *Newsletter* in which justice might be done to publications such as these, which combine material of high and urgent value with an enviable and, alas, all too rare clarity and lucidity of presentation.

The Conference on Asian Affairs, Inc., has supplied the following partial list of summer institutes, workshops, and courses for teachers, school administrators, businessmen, journalists, and other community leaders interested in the Far East. These programs, designed to provide the mature nonspecialist with a basic introduction to Asian problems, are sponsored by the following colleges and universities in cooperation with the Asia Foundation and the Japan Society. Scholarships offered cover tuition and, in some cases, full or partial maintenance.

BROOKLYN COLLEGE, Brooklyn 10, N. Y., June 24—July 30, 1957.

Workshop on the Far East.

Courses: The Far East, a survey for undergraduates and prospective teachers; History of the Far East; Education for a World Community.

Twenty scholarships of \$100 each, for tuition and/or other fees and expenses.

Address inquiries to: Professor Hyman Kublin, Department of History, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn 10, N. Y.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, Berkeley 4, Calif.

Work Conference on Asia in the Curriculum, June 24-28, 1957.

Lectures, films, discussions.

Thirty grants-in-aid, covering travel and subsistence.

Summer Session, June 17—July 27, 1957.

Courses: Cultural Growth; Art of East Asia; Economic Development and Problems of the Far East; Geography of the Far East; History of Japan (modern); Seminar in the History and Civilization of the Far East (prior to the 20th century); Systems of Chinese Writing; Chinese Poetry in English Translation.

Thirteen grants-in-aid of \$160 each, for tuition and maintenance.

Address inquiries to: East Asia Studies, Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley 4, California.

DUKE UNIVERSITY, Durham, N. C., July 19—Aug. 24, 1957.

Summer Program in Asian Studies, with emphasis on India and Japan.

Courses: Japanese Civilization; Far Eastern Politics.

Ten scholarships of \$200 each.

Address inquiries to: Director of Summer Session, Duke University, Durham, N. C.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, Gainesville, Florida, June 16—July 28, 1957.

Summer Program on Asia.

Courses: A General Introduction to Eastern Asia (single course with differing emphasis each week on religion, social structure, economy, politics, foreign affairs, and art).

Twenty-four scholarships of \$130 each covering tuition and maintenance. Limited to teachers in the high schools and junior colleges of Florida.

Address inquiries to: Professor John A. Harrison, 111 Peabody Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, Lawrence, Kansas, June 10—Aug. 4, 1957.

Summer Institute on Asia.

Courses: Modernization of China and Japan; Southeast Asia in Modern Times; Readings in Asian History.

Ten scholarships of \$250 each.

Address inquiries to: History Department, The University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, Ann Arbor, Michigan, June 24—Aug. 3, 1957.

Summer Workshop on Asia.

Courses: Workshop in Asian Studies (history, anthropology, political science, Far Eastern languages and literature).

Twelve scholarships of \$250 each.

Address inquiries to:

On Courses: Dr. Robert I. Crane, Department of History

On Scholarships: Dean, Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, Columbus 10, Ohio, June 18—Aug. 30, 1957.

Graduate Summer Program on the Far East.

Courses: Interdepartmental (Political Science, Sociology, Geography)

Graduate Seminar on the Cultural Bases of Far Eastern Social and Political Organization; Interdepartmental (Political Science, Sociology, Geography) Pro-Seminar on the Contemporary Far East;

Special Problems: Far East (Political Science, Sociology, Geog-

rship); Graduate Research: Preparation for Thesis (Political Science and Sociology).

Seven cash scholarships of \$300 each; three cash scholarships of \$250 each. Nonresident fee will be waived for out-of-state recipients of scholarships.

Address inquiries to: Professor Kazuo Kawai, 100 University Hall, The Ohio State University, Columbus 10, Ohio.

STATE UNIVERSITY TEACHERS COLLEGE, New Paltz, New York, July 1—Aug. 9, 1957.

Interdivisional Seminar in Teaching about Asia.

Some scholarship assistance available.

Address inquiries to: Director of Summer Session, State University Teachers College, New Paltz, N. Y.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, Syracuse 10, N. Y., July 1—Aug. 9, 1957.

Summer Program of Asian Studies.

Courses: Cultural Patterns in China; Cultural Patterns in Japan; Geography of Asia; Geography of China; History of China; History of Japan; Beginning Japanese Language.

Ten tuition scholarships of approximately \$180 each; five fellowships of approximately \$200 each.

Address inquiries to: Professor Douglas G. Haring, P. O. Box 24, University Station, Syracuse 10, N. Y.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, Seattle 5, Wash., June 24—Aug. 22, 1957.

Far Eastern and Russian Institute: Summer Program and Workshop for Teachers.

Courses: Problems of the Pacific; Modern Chinese History; Modern Japanese History; Economic Problems of the Far East; Geography of Asia; Chinese Language (intensive); Japanese Conversation (first year). Courses on Russia also available.

Twenty-five scholarships of \$100 each available to teachers participating in the Workshop.

Address inquiries to: Far Eastern and Russian Institute, University of Washington, Seattle 5, Wash.

The Netherlands Universities Foundation for International Cooperation announces a 1957 Summer Session of the Netherlands University to be held at the University of Nijmegen from July 16 to August 3. The Session will be devoted to a review of some basic facts, ideas, and problems of man's unity and diversity under the general title "The Community of Mankind and

Cross-Cultural Relations." The mornings will be devoted to lectures, given in English, and the afternoons to seminars, discussion groups, and excursions. All students who complete the course will receive certificates, and United States students wishing to obtain credits are requested to contact the Session's Secretariat. The fee for the course is 90 Dutch guilders for tuition only or 185 Dutch guilders for tuition and maintenance (excluding dinner). Also, special one-week Introductory Courses on the Netherlands will be organized on request for groups of at least twenty persons. For further information write to Mrs. A. F. P. Volten, Head of the N.U.F.F.I.C. Summer Courses' Secretariat, 27 Molenstraat, The Hague, The Netherlands.

A recent communication from UAI informs us that the Academy has received word from M. J. d'Ormesson, Associate Secretary General of CIPSH, that the General Conference of UNESCO held in New Delhi took favorable action upon the request submitted on the Academy's behalf for subventions to enable it to continue some of its most important projects in the humanities. A sum of \$11,000 was voted for the support during 1957 of the following projects, in the amounts requested: Concordance et Indices de la Tradition Musulmane, \$1,600; Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, \$2,500; Nouveau Dictionnaire du Latin Médiéval, \$4,000; Aristoteles Latinus, \$700; Tabula Imperii Romani, \$1,200; Documents inédits concernant le Japon, \$1,000. The gratitude of the Academy for this continued support has been conveyed to the officers of UNESCO and of CIPSH.

Translation, the Cinderella of the arts, is receiving increased attention these days, although perhaps more in the role of serving-wench than of princess in a golden coach drawn by six white horses. In fact, for the horses the hour of midnight *may* be approaching when, in a modern version of the old fairy tale, their place will be taken by machines and they themselves will be put out to grass in some upland pasture which they will leave only for use on state occasions of literary significance. As, however, those who have noticed the announcement of the ACLS program of grants for summer study in linguistic problems of machine translation will know, the hour of midnight has not yet struck.

Apropos translation—and considerably more—we would like to draw to the attention of our readers a program, which we have recently received from The Research Agency in London, England, of a wide range of services for academic projects. The Agency offers to provide not only translations but also extracts from or photostatic copies of written or printed materials, bibliographical information, and so forth, and the services of specialists in medical, legal, economic, historical, and other fields of study, together with expert

assistance in tracing and providing materials available from British and other European sources. Further information can be obtained from the Secretary, Mrs. E. Finer, 10 Clorane Gardens, Hampstead, London, N.W.3.

The Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission would be glad to receive information about any commemorative event held in connection with the Woodrow Wilson Centennial last year and requests that any group which sponsored an event of this kind send in a detailed résumé, accompanied where possible by press clippings. The information is to be used in the compilation of a report to be submitted to Congress this spring and should be addressed to the Commission at the Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C.

The title of a new journal of the humanities, arts, and sciences, which is to be launched in the fall of 1957, is "Victorian Studies." The journal will be edited and published at Indiana University by Philip Appleman, William A. Madden, and Michael Wolff. It is defined by its editors as "a quarterly journal devoted to the examination of Victorian culture; designed to work toward a deliberate coordination of the various academic disciplines, it will include articles in any of the humanities, arts, and sciences as well as book reviews, the annual Victorian Bibliography (sponsored by the Victorian group of the Modern Language Association), a forum for the discussion of controversial issues, and notes and queries in addition to articles." A brochure elaborates the scope of the journal as embracing "English culture during the period extending approximately from 1830 to 1914," and states "that the proposed chronological limits are only indications of a center, and that study of the years before and after may well illuminate the years between."

The publication will be priced at an annual \$5.00 in the United States or 35 shillings in the United Kingdom, and the Advisory Board consists of sixteen American and eight British members. On the American side are to be found the names of several scholars who are or have been closely connected with the ACLS; in fact, they include that of Howard Mumford Jones, Chairman of the Board of the Council, while William Riley Parker, formerly Secretary of the Board, is to act as editorial consultant.



